# Labeled Multi-object Tracking Algorithms for Generic Observation Model

Suqi Li, Wei Yi, Bailu Wang, Lingjiang Kong
University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, School of Electronic Engineering, Chengdu City, China
Email: kussoyi@gmail.com

arXiv:1604.01202v1 [cs.SY] 5 Apr 2016

***Abstract*—In this paper, we are devoted to the labeled multi-object tracking problem for generic observation model (GOM) in the framework of Finite set statistics. Firstly, we derive a product-labeled multi-object (P-LMO) filter following by the P-LMO formed density which is a more detailed expression for the general labeled multi-object density [1]. The proposed P-LMO filter is a closed form solution to labeled multi-object Bayesian filter under the standard multi-object transition kernel and generic multi-object likelihood and thus can be used as the performance benchmark in labeled multi-object tracking. Secondly, we propose a generalization of LMB filter, named LMB filter for GOM by approximating the full multi-object density as a class of LMB density matching the original labeled first order moment as well as minimizing the Kullback-Leibler divergence from the original multi-object density. The LMB-GOM filter can be seen as a principled approximation of P-LMO filter, which not only inherits the advantages of the multi-Bernoulli filter for image data with the intuitive mathematical structure of multi-Bernoulli RFS, but also the accuracy of P-LMO filter with less computation burden. In numerical experiments, the performance of the proposed algorithms are verified in typical tracking scenarios.**

## I. Introduction

Finite set statistics (FISST) [2] has become a hot spot in multi-object inference for the random finite set (RFS) perfectly matches the behavior of multi-object dynamic system especially in terms of the ability to capture the randomness of number and values of objects, as well as the statistical correlation between objects. FISST has attracted substantial interest from academia as well as the commercial sector with applications spanning many areas such as forestry [3], biology [4], physics [5], computer vision [6], wireless networks [7], communications [8], multi-object tracking [9], [10], and robotic [11]. The core of multi-object tracking is Bayesian filter, however, it is usually practically intractable due to that the set integral suffers from the cure of dimensionality and the combinational nature of problem especially for large number of objects. In order to solve this problems, several tractable approximations of multi-object Bayesian filter are proposed successively, namely, probability hypothesis density (PHD) filter [12], cardinalized PHD filter [13], and multi-Bernoulli filter [14], [15].

With the recent development of labeled set filters [1], [16]–[21] and their advantageous performance compared to previous (unlabeled) random set filters, such as identifying object identities, simplifying the multi-object transition kernel, the study on FISST based multi-object tracking algorithms turns to the labeled versions gradually. In [16], Vo et al. proposed a class of generalized labeled multi-Bernoulli (GLMB) density [1] which is a conjugate prior and also closed under the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation for the standard observation model in Bayesian inference. The only disadvantage of GLMB filter is that it exhibits an exponential growth in the number of posterior components and tractable techniques for truncating the posterior and prediction densities were provided in [17]. Later, in order to further improve the computation efficiency, principled approximations of GLMB filters are proposed, including labeled multi-Bernoulli (LMB) filter [20] and marginalized $\delta$-GLMB filter [18]. These two filters are computationally cheaper, as well as reserve the key statistical properties of the full multi-object posterior density and thus have decent accuracy.

However, the aforementioned labeled set filters are all originally designed for standard observation model. Taking the GLMB density for instance, it is designed as a conjugate prior for the standard observation model and has lost a certain degree of correlation between objects towards the general case, and hence it is not necessary closed under generic observation model (GOM) [1]. To make GLMB filter accommodate the GOM, Papi et al. proposed a class of $\delta$-GLMB densities which are used to approximate the general labeled multi-object density with the cardinality distribution and the first moment preserved, as well as the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD) minimized in [1]. This approximation is then used to develop an efficient $\delta$-GLMB filter for GOM. To distinguish it with the conventional $\delta$-GLMB filter, we call it $\delta$-GLMB filter for GOM ($\delta$-GLMB-GOM). [1] also provides a further detailed expression for general labeled multi-object density, which is the product of the joint existence probability of the label set and the joint probability density of states conditional on their corresponding labels, referred as product-labeled multi-object (P-LMO) density in this paper. The P-LMO formed density is fundamental in the derivation of the $\delta$-GLMB RFS approximation of general labeled RFS and the update equations of $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter.

In this paper, we are devoted to the labeled multi-object tracking problem for GOM, and our contributions are two-fold:

[1]GLMB distribution is also simply named as Vo-Vo distribution by Malher in his book [10] first time.

Firstly, we derive a P-LMO filter following by the P-LMO formed density which is a closed form solution to labeled multi-object Bayesian filter under the standard multi-object transition kernel and generic multi-object likelihood. As the prediction and update equations of P-LMO filter do not make any approximations, it can be used as the performance benchmark in labeled multi-object tracking. Essentially, the $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter is an approximation of P-LMO filter.

Secondly, we propose a generalization of LMB filter, named LMB filter for GOM (LMB-GOM) by approximating the full multi-object density as a class of LMB density matching the original labeled first order moment as well as minimizing the KLD from the original multi-object density. The LMB-GOM filter can be seen as a principled approximation of P-LMO filter and $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter. The proposed LMB-GOM filter inherits the advantages of the multi-Bernoulli filter for image data [15] with the intuitive mathematical structure of multi-Bernoulli RFS, but can handle the closely spaced objects well. It also inherits the accuracy of P-LMO filter and $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter, but has less computation burden (the growth of posterior component number is linear with object number).

The numerical experiments with scenarios involving both closely spaced objects and well-separated objects highlight the performance of the proposed algorithms.

## II. Background

### A. Notations

We adhere to the convention that single-object states are represented by lowercase letters, e.g., $\mathbf{x}$, while multi-object states are represented by uppercase letters, e.g., $\mathbf{X}$, $X$. To distinguish labeled states and distributions from the unlabeled ones, bold-type letters are adopted for the labeled ones, e.g., $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{X}$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. Moreover, blackboard bold letters represent spaces, e.g., the state space is represented by $\mathbb{X}$, the label space by $\mathbb{L}$. The collection of all finite sets of $\mathbb{X}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X})$.

The labeled single-object state $\mathbf{x}$ is constructed by augmenting a state $x \in \mathbb{X}$ with a label $\ell \in \mathbb{L}$. The labels are usually drawn from a discrete label space, $\mathbb{L} = \{\alpha_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where all $\alpha_i$ are distinct and the index space $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of positive integers.

We use the multi-object exponential notation

$$h^X \triangleq \prod_{x \in X} h(x) \tag{1}$$

for real-valued function $h$, with $h^{\emptyset} = 1$ by convention. To admit arbitrary arguments like sets, vectors and integers, the generalized Kronecker delta function is given by

$$\delta_Y(X) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1, \text{if } X = Y \\ 0, \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

and the inclusion function is given by

$$1_Y(X) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1, \text{if} X \subseteq Y \\ 0, \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

If $X$ is a singleton, i.e., $X = \{x\}$, the notation $1_Y(X)$ is used instead of $1_Y(\{x\})$.

The integrals are using the inner product notation. For functions $a(x)$ and $b(x)$ defined on $\mathbb{X}$, the inner product is represented as $\langle a, b \rangle = \int a(x)b(x)dx$.

### B. Labeled RFS and Product-Labeled Multi-object Density

A *labeled RFS* is an RFS whose elements are identified by distinct labels [16], [17]. A *labeled RFS* with (kinematic) state space $\mathbb{X}$ and (discrete) label space $\mathbb{L}$ is an RFS on $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{L}$ such that each realization $\mathbf{X}$ has distinct labels, i.e., $|\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X})| = |\mathbf{X}|$. A labeled RFS and its unlabeled version have the same cardinality distribution.

As shown in Lemma 1 [1], for an arbitrary labeled RFS, its multi-object density can be represented as the expression which is the product of joint existence probability of the label set and the joint probability density on $\mathbb{X}$ conditional on their labels, hence in this paper we call the product styled LMO density as P-LMO density.

**Lemma 1.** *Given a labeled multi-object density $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ on $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{L})$, and any positive integer $n$, we define the joint existence probability of the label set $\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \cdots, \ell_n\}$ by*

$$\omega(\{\ell_1, \cdots, \ell_n\}) = \int \boldsymbol{\pi}(\{(x_1, \ell_1), \cdots, (x_n, \ell_n)\}) d(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \tag{4}$$

*and the joint probability density on $\mathbb{X}$ of the states $x_1, \cdots, x_n$ conditional on their corresponding labels $\ell_1, \cdots, \ell_n$ by*

$$P(\{(x_1, \ell_1), \cdots, (x_n, \ell_n)\}) = \frac{\boldsymbol{\pi}(\{(x_1, \ell_1), \cdots, (x_n, \ell_n)\})}{\omega(\{\ell_n, \cdots, \ell_n\})} \tag{5}$$

*Thus, the labeled multi-object density can be expressed as*

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}(\mathbf{X}) = \omega(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}))P(\mathbf{X}) \tag{6}$$

### C. Labeled Multi-Bernoulli RFS

A labeled multi-Bernoulli (LMB) RFS with state space $\mathbb{X}$, label space $\mathbb{L}$ and (finite) parameter set $\{(r^{(\ell)}, p^{(\ell)}(x)) : \ell \in \mathbb{L}\}$, is distributed according to

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}(\mathbf{X}) = \triangle(\mathbf{X}) w(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X})) p^{\mathbf{X}} \tag{7}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \triangle(\mathbf{X}) =& \delta_{|\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X})|}(|\mathbf{X}|) \\ \omega(I) =& \prod_{i \in \mathbb{L}} (1 - r^{(i)}) \prod_{\ell \in L} \frac{1_{\mathbb{L}}(\ell) r^{(\ell)}}{1 - r^{(\ell)}} \\ p(x, \ell) =& p^{(\ell)}(x) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

and $r^{(\ell)}$ represents the existence probability of track $\ell$, and $p^{(\ell)}(x)$ is the probability density of the kinematic state of track $\ell$ given its existence.

### D. Multi-object Bayesian filter

Multi-object Bayesian filter is the core of multi-object filtering in random finite set framework. To incorporate object tracks in the multi-object Bayesian filtering framework, objects are identified by an ordered pair of integers $\ell = (k, i)$, where $k$ is the time of birth, and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ is a unique index to distinguish objects born at the same time. The label space for objects born at time $k$, denoted as $\mathbb{L}_k$, is then $k \times \mathbb{N}$. An object born at time $k$, has state $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{L}_k$. The label space for objects at time $k$ (including those born prior to $k$), denoted as $\mathbb{L}_{0:k}$, is constructed recursively by $\mathbb{L}_{0:k} = \mathbb{L}_{0:k-1} \cup \mathbb{L}_k$. A multi-object state $\mathbf{X}$ at time $k$, is a finite subset of $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{L}_{0:k}$. Note that $\mathbb{L}_{0:k-1}$ and $\mathbb{L}_k$ are disjoint.

The multi-object posterior density $\boldsymbol{\pi}_k$ is propagated forward recursively by the multi-object Bayesian filter,

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_{k|k-1}(\mathbf{X}_k) = \int \mathbf{f}_{k|k-1}(\mathbf{X}_k|\mathbf{X})\boldsymbol{\pi}_{k-1}(\mathbf{X})\delta\mathbf{X} \tag{9}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_k(\mathbf{X}_k) = \frac{g_k(Z_k|\mathbf{X}_k)\boldsymbol{\pi}_{k|k-1}(\mathbf{X}_k)}{\int g_k(Z_k|\mathbf{X})\boldsymbol{\pi}_{k|k-1}(\mathbf{X})\delta\mathbf{X}} \tag{10}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{k|k-1}$ is the multi-object predicted density from time $k-1$ to time $k$; $\mathbf{f}_{k|k-1}(\cdot|\cdot)$ is the multi-object transition density; $g_k(\cdot|\cdot)$ is the multi-object likelihood function with $Z_k$ is the set of observations at time $k$.

For convenience, in what follows we omit explicit references to the time index $k$, and denote $\mathbb{L} \triangleq \mathbb{L}_{0:k}$, $\mathbb{B} \triangleq \mathbb{L}_k$, $\mathbb{L}_+ \triangleq \mathbb{L}_{k+1} \cup \mathbb{B}$, $\boldsymbol{\pi} \triangleq \boldsymbol{\pi}_k$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_+ \triangleq \boldsymbol{\pi}_{k+1|k}$, $g \triangleq g_k$, and $\mathbf{f} \triangleq \mathbf{f}_{k|k+1}$.

### E. Multi-object Transition Kernel and Generic Multi-object Likelihood

Given the labeled multi-object state $\mathbf{X}$, each state $(x, \ell) \in \mathbf{X}$ either continues to exist at the next time step with probability $p_S(x, \ell)$ and evolves to a new state $(x_+, \ell_+)$ with probability density $f_+(x_+|x, \ell)\delta_{\ell_+}(\ell)$, or dies with probability $1 - p_S(x, \ell)$. According to Lemma 1, the distribution of the set of new objects born at time $k$ can be factorized as

$$\mathbf{f}_B(\mathbf{Y}) = \omega_B(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Y}))P_B(\mathbf{Y}) \tag{11}$$

Note that $\mathbf{f}_B$ also can be specified as LMB density in (12) or GLMB density [16] in (13).

$$\mathbf{f}_B(\mathbf{Y}) = \Delta(\mathbf{Y})\omega_B(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Y}))[p_B]^{\mathbf{Y}} \tag{12}$$

$$\mathbf{f}_B(\mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{c\in\mathbb{C}} \omega_B^{(c)}(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Y}))[p_B^{(c)}]^{\mathbf{Y}} \tag{13}$$

The birth density $\mathbf{f}_B$ is defined on $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbf{f}_B(\mathbf{Y}) = 0$ if $\mathbf{Y}$ contains any element $\mathbf{y}$ with $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}) \notin \mathbb{B}$.

The multi-object state $\mathbf{X}_+$ is the superposition of surviving objects and the new born objects. If the objects evolve independently of each other and the surviving objects are also independent of births, then the multi-object transition function is given by [17]

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_+|\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{f}_S(\mathbf{X}_+ \cap (\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{L})|\mathbf{X})\mathbf{f}_B(\mathbf{X}_+ - (\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{L}_+)) \tag{14}$$

where

$$\mathbf{f}_S(\mathbf{W}|\mathbf{X}) = \Delta(\mathbf{W})\Delta(\mathbf{X})1_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X})}(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}))[\Phi(\mathbf{W};\cdot)]^{\mathbf{X}} \tag{15}$$

$$\Phi(\mathbf{W}; x, \ell) = \begin{cases} p_S(x, \ell)f(x_+|x, \ell), & \text{if } (x_+, \ell) \in \mathbf{W} \\ 1 - p_S(x, \ell), & \ell \notin \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}) \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

The observation model considers the general case with a generic multi-object density $g(Z|\mathbf{X})$ which has two categories: separable and non-separable multi-object likelihood functions. A separable multi-object likelihood of the state $\mathbf{X}$ given the observation $Z$ can be represented as [1]

$$g(Z|\mathbf{X}) \propto \prod_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{X}} \gamma(\mathbf{x}) \tag{17}$$

where $\gamma(\mathbf{x})$ is a non-negative function defined on $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{L}$. Poisson, independent identically distributed (i.i.d) cluster, multi-Bernoulli and GLMB density are all the conjugate with respective to separable multi-object likelihood according to [1]. The separable multi-object likelihood assumes that the observations illuminated by different objects cannot be overlapped with the typical example the rigid body model for image data [15].

However, this assumption cannot be valid when the superpositions of the observations of different objects do exist, for example the closely spaced objects. Then (17) cannot be satisfied, and non-separable multi-object likelihood is required. The aforementioned densities are not necessarily conjugate prior with respect to non-separable likelihood. The typical examples of non-separable likelihood are the standard multi-object likelihood [2], [16] and the track-before-detect (TBD) observation model in [23]–[28].

## III. P-LMO Filter

In this section, we derive the multi-object prediction and update equations of Bayesian filter by specifying the multi-object prior and posterior as P-LMO density, referred to as the P-LMO filter, as shown in Propositions 1 and 2. P-LMO filter is a closed form solution of labeled multi-object Bayesian filter for generic observation model, and thus can be used as a performance benchmark in labeled multi-object tracking.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose that the current multi-object posterior density is a P-LMO density of the form (6) and the distribution of the set of new born objects is also a P-LMO density of the form (11), then the multi-object predicted density is given by*

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_+(\mathbf{X}) = \omega_+(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}))P_+(\mathbf{X}) \tag{18}$$

*with state space $\mathbb{X}$ and label space $\mathbb{L}_+ = \mathbb{L} \cup \mathbb{B}$, where*

$$\omega_+(I) = \omega_B(I \cap \mathbb{B})\omega_S(I \cap \mathbb{L}) \tag{19}$$

$$P_+(\mathbf{X}) = P_B(\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{B})P_S(\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{L}) \tag{20}$$

$$\omega_S(L) = \sum_{I\subseteq\mathbb{L}} 1_I(L)\omega(I)\eta_{S,I-L}(L) \tag{21}$$

$$P_S(\mathbf{X}) \propto \sum_{I\subseteq\mathbb{L}} 1_I(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}))\omega(I)P_{S,I-\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X})}(\mathbf{X}) \tag{22}$$

$$P_{S,\{\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_n\}}(\{(x_{+,1}, \ell_{+,1}), \cdots, (x_{+,n_+}, \ell_{+,n_+})\}) =$$

$$\int \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Phi(\{(x_{+,1},\ell_{+,1},\cdots,(x_{+,n_+},\ell_{+,n_+})\};x_i,\ell_i) P(\{(x_1,\ell_1),\cdots,(x_n,\ell_n)\})d(x_1\cdots x_n) \tag{23}$$

$$\eta_{S,\{\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_n\}}(\ell_{+,1},\cdots,\ell_{+,n_+}) = \int P_{S,\{\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_n\}}(\{(x_{+,1},\ell_{+,1}),\cdots,(x_{+,n_+},\ell_{+,n_+})\}) d(x_{+,1}\cdots x_{+,n_+}). \tag{24}$$

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose that the current multi-object predicted density is a P-LMO density with state space $\mathbb{X}$ and the label space $\mathbb{L}_+$ of the form (18) , and the multi-object likelihood function $g(Z|\mathbf{X})$ is generic, then the multi-object posterior density is given by*

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}(\mathbf{X}|Z) = \omega(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X});Z)P(\mathbf{X}|Z) \tag{25}$$

*with with state space $\mathbb{X}$ and the label space $\mathbb{L}_+$, where*

$$P(\mathbf{X}|Z) = \frac{g(Z|\mathbf{X})P_+(\mathbf{X})}{\eta_Z(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}))} \tag{26}$$

$$\omega(I;Z) \propto \eta_Z(I)\omega_+(I) \tag{27}$$

$$\eta_Z(\{\ell_1,\ell_2,\cdots,\ell_n\}) = \int g(Z|\{(x_1,\ell_1),\cdots,(x_n,\ell_n)\}) \cdot P_+(\{(x_1,\ell_1),\cdots,(x_n,\ell_n)\}) d(x_1,\cdots,x_n). \tag{28}$$

According to Propositions 1 and 2, the implementation of P-LMO filter amounts to computing parameters $\{\omega(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X})),P(\mathbf{X})\}_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X})\in\mathbb{L}}$ forwards in time. It can be seen that the implementation of P-LMO involves both integrals on high-dimensional spaces and the combinational nature of problems (the combination number increases exponentially with object number).

To enable the generic observation model with a non-separable multi-object likelihood function, Proposition 2 (update step) cannot be simplified for objects posteriors have correlation between each other and should be considered jointly, but Proposition 1 (prediction step) can be further simplified for the motions of different objects are independent of each other in general. In [1], the $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter is derived by approximating the multi-object posterior as a $\delta$-GLMB density, and hence the prediction equations only need to integral on single object space, but the combinational nature of problems still exists and the number of components grows exponentially with object number.

## IV. LMB Filter for Generic Observation Model

In the following, we derive the LMB-GOM filter by approximating the multi-object posterior as an LMB density. Compared with P-LMO and $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter, LMB-GOM filter has even simpler prediction equations which only need integrals on single object space and the number of integrals is the same as target number. Compared with multi-Bernoulli filter for image data in [15], the LMB-GOM filter can produce tracks formally and handle the closely spaced objects well.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose that the current multi-object prediction is an LMB density with parameters $\boldsymbol{\pi}_+ = \{r_+^{(\ell)},p_+^{(\ell)}(\cdot)\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{L}_+}$. Given a generic multi-object likelihood $g(Z|\mathbf{X})$, the LMB RFS that matches exactly the labeled first-order moment of multi-object posterior as well as minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence from the multi-object posterior is $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|Z) = \{r^{(\ell)},p^{(\ell)}(\cdot)\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{L}_+}$, where*

$$r^{(\ell)} = \sum_{I_+\in\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{L}_+)} 1_{I_+}(\ell)\omega(I_+;Z) \tag{29}$$

$$p^{(\ell)}(x) = \frac{1}{r^\ell}\sum_{I_+\in\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{L}_+)} 1_{I_+}(\ell)\omega(I_+;Z)p_{I_+-\{\ell\}}(x,\ell|Z) \tag{30}$$

*with*

$$p_{\{\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_n\}}(x,\ell|Z) = \int P(\{(x,\ell),(x_1,\ell_1),\cdots,(x_n,\ell_n)\}|Z) \cdot d(x_1,\cdots,x_n) \tag{31}$$

$$\omega(I_+;Z) \propto \eta_Z(I)\omega_+(I_+), \tag{32}$$

$$P(\mathbf{X}|Z) = \frac{[p_+]^{\mathbf{X}}g(Z|\mathbf{X})}{\eta_Z(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}))} \tag{33}$$

$$\omega_+(I_+) = \prod_{i\in\mathbb{L}_+}(1-r_+^\ell)\prod_{\ell\in I_+}\frac{1_{\mathbb{L}}(\ell)r_+^{(\ell)}}{1-r_+^{(\ell)}} \tag{34}$$

$$\eta_Z(\{\ell_1,\ell_2,\cdots,\ell_n\}) = \int g(Z|\{(x_1,\ell_1),\cdots,(x_n,\ell_n)\}) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n}p_+(x_i,\ell_i)\right)d(x_1,\cdots,x_n) \tag{35}$$

*Proof:* Firstly, one can write the LMB prediction density in the form of P-LMO density as

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_+(\mathbf{X}) = \Delta(\mathbf{X})\omega_+(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X}))[p_+]^{\mathbf{X}} \tag{36}$$

with $\omega_+(\cdot)$ shown as (34). Then, given the non-separable likelihood $g(Z|\mathbf{X})$, by applying Bayesian update equation, we can obtain the following multi-object posterior,

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}(\mathbf{X}|Z) = \Delta(\mathbf{X})\omega(\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{X});Z)P(\mathbf{X}|Z) \tag{37}$$

where the quantities $\omega(\cdot;Z)$ and $P(\cdot|Z)$ are shown as (33) and (32).

The (labeled) PHD of the labeled multi-object posterior is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &v(x,\ell)\\ =&\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n!}\sum_{(\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_n)\in\mathbb{L}^n}(1-1_{\{\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_n\}}(\ell))\omega(\{\ell,\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_n\};Z)\\ &\cdot\int P(\{(x,\ell),(x_1,\ell_1),\cdots,(x_n,\ell_n)\}|Z)dx_1\cdots dx_n\\ =&\sum_{L\in\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{L})}(1-1_L(\ell))\omega(\{\ell\cup L\};Z)p_L(x,\ell|Z)\\ =&\sum_{I\in\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{L})}1_I(\ell)\omega(I;Z)p_{I-\{\ell\}}(x,\ell|Z) \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

which actually depicts the PHD of each tracks. Comparing the above expression with the labeled PHD for the proposed LMB approximation, one can find easily they are identical. Hence the proposed LMB approximation matches the original posterior in terms of the labeled PHD.

Moreover, as for the proof of that $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\cdot|Z) = \{r^{(\ell)}, p^{(\ell)}(\cdot)\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{L}_+}$ minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence from the multi-object posterior, one can refer to [22]. ■

Utilizing Proposition 3 and the prediction equations of LMB filter in [18], we can obtain the LMB-GOM filter shown as follows:

***LMB prediction***: Given the current posterior LMB density with parameter set $\boldsymbol{\pi} = \{r^{(\ell)}, p^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{L}}$ and the LMB multi-object birth with parameter set , $\boldsymbol{\pi}_B = \{r_B^{(\ell)}, p_B^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{B}}$, then the multi-object prediction is also an LMB density on state space $\mathbb{X}$ and finite label space $\mathbb{L}_+ = \mathbb{B}\cup\mathbb{L}$ given by the parameter set

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_+ = \{r_{+,S}^{(\ell)}, p_{+,S}^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{L}} \cup \{r_B^{(\ell)}, p_B^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{B}} \tag{39}$$

where

$$r_{+,S} = \eta_S(\ell) r^{(\ell)} \tag{40}$$

$$p_{+,S}(x) = \left\langle p_S(\cdot,\ell) f(x|\cdot,\ell), p(\cdot,\ell)\right\rangle / \eta_S(\ell) \tag{41}$$

$$\eta_S(\ell) = \left\langle p_S(\cdot,\ell), p(\cdot,\ell)\right\rangle \tag{42}$$

***LMB update***: Given the current predicted LMB density with parameter set $\boldsymbol{\pi}_+ = \{r_+^{(\ell)}, p_+^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{L}_+}$ and under the non-separable multi-object likelihood function $g(Z|\mathbf{X})$, the posterior multi-object density also can be approximated as an LMB RFS with parameters set $\{r^{(\ell)}, p^{(\ell)}\}_{\ell\in\mathbb{L}_+}$ based on Proposition 3 with the specified formulas are shown as (29) and (33).

## V. Comparisons among Labeled Multi-object Tracking algorithms for GOM

In this section, we compare the P-LMO, $\delta$-GLMB-GOM, LMB-GOM filters in terms of the computational complexity of their respective prediction and update equations and the correlation between object posteriors.

- ***P-LMO filter***: In the prediction equation, the main computation mainly focuses on the quantities $\eta_{S,I-L}(I), L\subseteq I, I\subseteq\mathbb{L}$ in (24) which involve $\sum_{a=n}^{|\mathbb{L}|} C_a^n$ times of integrals on $\mathbb{X}^n$ with $n$ varying from 1 to $|\mathbb{L}|$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the cardinality of the set $\cdot$ and $C_a^n$ denotes $n$-combination of $a$. In the update equation, the main computation mainly focuses on the quantities $\eta_Z(I), I\subseteq\mathbb{L}_+$ in (28) which involve $C_{|\mathbb{L}_+|}^n$ times of integrals on $\mathbb{X}^n$ with $n$ varying from 1 to $|\mathbb{L}_+|$. P-LMO posterior is a general multi-object density which captures the statistics of object posteriors jointly and preserves complete correlation between objects.
- ***$\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter***: In the prediction equation, the main computation mainly focuses on the quantities $\eta_S^{(I)}(\ell), \ell\in I, I\subseteq\mathbb{L}$ which involve $\sum_{n=1}^{|\mathbb{L}|} n\cdot C_{|\mathbb{L}|}^n$ times of integrals on $\mathbb{X}$. In the update equation, the main computation mainly focus on the quantities $\eta_Z(I), I\subseteq\mathbb{L}_+$ whose computational complexity are the same as P-LMO filter. $\delta$-GLMB posterior preserves a certain degree of correlation between objects compared with P-LMO posterior. The recursion of $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter refers to [1].
- ***LMB-GOM filter***: In the prediction equation, the main computation mainly focuses on the quantities $\eta_S(\ell), \ell\in\mathbb{L}$ in (42) which involve $|\mathbb{L}|$ times of integrals on $\mathbb{X}$. In the update equation, the main computation mainly focus on the quantities $\eta_Z(I), I\subseteq\mathbb{L}_+$ in (35) whose computational complexity are also the same as P-LMO filter. LMB posterior totally loses correlation between objects.

To summarize, the computational complexity of update equations of all algorithms are at the same level because object posteriors are all considered jointly to accommodate the generic observation model. However, the prediction equations can be simplified by approximating the multi-object posterior as $\delta$-GLMB or LMB density. The more correlation the approximated density loses, the less burdensome the prediction equation is.

## VI. Numerical Results

In this subsection, we assess the performance of P-LMO and LMB-GOM filters for a TBD observation model in which object superpositions on observations are permitted when they are located in proximity. The performance of $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter [1] is also provided for comparison.

The surveillance region is divided into cells. The observations at the current frame number are collected in the vector $Z = (z_1, \cdots, z_M) \in \mathbb{R}^M$, with $z_j$ the intensity observation obtained in the $j$th cell. The intensity observations are assumed to be independently distributed conditioned on the multi-object state $\mathbf{X}$. The multi-object likelihood function can then be written as

$$g(Z|X) = \prod_{j=1}^{M} \ell(z_j|X) \tag{43}$$

where $\ell(z_j|X)$ is the observation density for the $j$th cell. In the numerical examples, a Gaussian model [29] is adopted, i.e.,

$$\ell(z_j|X) = \frac{\mathcal{N}\left(z_j; \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbf{X}} \sigma_j^T(\mathbf{x}), \sigma^N\right)}{\mathcal{N}\left(z_j; 0, \sigma^N\right)}$$

where $\mathcal{N}(z;\mu,\Gamma)$ denotes the Gaussian probability density evaluated at $z$ with mean $\mu$ and covariance matrix $\Gamma$, $\sigma_j^T(\mathbf{x})$ is the power contribution from object state $\mathbf{x}$ to the $j$th cell and $\sigma^N$ is the noise power. Here, $\sigma_j^T(\mathbf{x})$ is described by a point spread function, for example,

$$\sigma_j^T(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\delta_x\delta_y\sigma^T}{2\pi\sigma_b^2} \exp\left(-\frac{(\delta_x a-\theta_x)^2 + (\delta_y b-\theta_y)^2}{2\sigma_b^2}\right) \tag{44}$$

where $\sigma^T$ is the source power, $\sigma_b^2$ is the blurring factor, $(\theta_x,\theta_y)$ is the position of object $\mathbf{x}$, $\delta_x$ and $\delta_y$ are cell side

lengths, and $j = (a, b)$ denotes the position of $j$th cell in two-dimensionality image of the surveillance region. The signal to noise ratio (SNR) is defined by $10\log(\sigma^T/\sigma^N)$.

In the following experiments, measurements are collected on a $120\times60$ grid with cell side lengths of $\delta_x = \delta_y = 1m$. We apply a point spread function with the blurring factor $\delta_b^2 = 1$. The SNRs of all objects are selected to be 15dB. The effective template $I(\mathbf{x})$ is a $3\times3$ pixel square region whose center is closest to $(\theta_x, \theta_y)$.

Two typical tracking scenarios are involved. The first scenario with two objects well separated is shown in Fig. 1, and the second scenario with objects closed spaced are shown in Fig. 2. The number of total tracking frames is 30. Both objects are lasting from the 1st frame to the 30th frame.




Fig. 1. True tracks of scenario 1 and the output of LMB-GOM filter




Fig. 2. True tracks of scenario 2 and the output of LMB-GOM filter

P-LMO, $\delta$-GLMB-GOM, and LMB-GMO filters all adopt sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) implementation with the particle number $10^5$. For all filters, track initiations are performed within the same region around the true object states (see [15]). The performances of all algorithms are examined in terms of the Optimal Sub-Pattern Assignment (OSPA) error [30]. All performance metrics are averaged over 50 independent Monte Carlo runs.




Fig. 3. OSPA errors for $\delta$-GLMB-GOM, LMB-GOM and P-LMO Filter in Scenario 1 involving two well-separated objects




Fig. 4. OSPA errors for $\delta$-GLMB-GOM, LMB-GOM and P-LMO Filter in scenario 1 involving two closely spaced objects

Figs. 1 and 2 also show the output of LMB-GOM filter for a single run. It can be seen that LMB-GOM filter performs accurately and consistently for the entire scenario in the sense that it maintains locking on all tracks and correctly estimates object positions for both well-separated and closely spaced objects.

Figs. 3 and 4 show the estimation errors over frame number in terms of OPSA errors for all algorithms and for both scenarios. It can be seen that the P-LMO filter performs the best among all algorithms no matter when objects are well-separated or closely spaced, for it is the closed form solution of Bayesian filter without any assumption and preserves all correlation between objects. Hence it is reasonable to take the P-LMO filter as the performance benchmark of labeled multi-object tracking. In scenario 1 where two objects are well-

separated, the performances of LMB-GOM and $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filters are matchable and very close to the P-LMO filter. The explanation is that when objects are far away from each other, their posteriors are almost independent for their observations have none overlap. Hence, though the $\delta$-GLMB-GOM and LMO-GOM filters discard part or all of correlation between object posteriors, they still perform decently. As for scenario 2 where two objects are closely spaced for the entire scenario, the performance gaps between all algorithms increase, but still can be accepted. Specifically, their performances improve in the order that LMB-GOM, $\delta$-GLMB-GOM and P-LMO filters. The reason is that when objects are in proximity, their observations do exhibit superpositions making their posteriors strongly correlated. Hence, in this case discarding the correlation between objects has negative influence on performance. Moreover, the degree of approximation in LMB-GOM filter is heavier than $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter, thus LMB-GOM filter performs a little poorly than $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter.

## VII. Conclusion

This paper focuses on the labeled multi-object tracking problem for generic observation model (GOM) in the framework of finite set statistics. Our contributions are two-fold. Firstly, we derived a product-labeled multi-object (P-LMO) filter following by the P-LMO formed density which is a closed form solution to labeled multi-object Bayesian filter under the standard multi-object transition kernel and generic multi-object likelihood. Hence, the proposed P-LMO filter can be used as the performance benchmark in labeled multi-object tracking. Secondly, we proposed a generalization of LMB filter, named LMB filter for GOM (LMB-GOM) which is derived by approximating the full multi-object density using a class of LMB density with its labeled first order moment matched. The LMB-GOM filter not only inherits the advantage of the multi-Bernoulli filter for image data with the intuitive mathematical structure of multi-Bernoulli RFS, but also inherits the accuracy of P-LMO filter and $\delta$-GLMB-GOM filter with less computation burden. Numerical results highlight the performance of both P-LMO and LMB-GOM filters for both closely spaced objects and well-separated objects.

## References


[1] F. Papi, B. N. Vo, B. T. Vo, C. Fantacci, and M. Beard, "Generalized labeled multi-Bernoulli approximation of multi-object densities," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 63, No. 20, pp. 5487–5497, 2015.

[2] R. Mahler, Statistical multisource-multitarget information fusion, Norwood, MA: Artech House, 2007.

[3] D. Stoyan and A. Penttinen, "Recent applications of point process methods in forestry statistics," *Statistical Science*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 61-78, 2000.

[4] V. Marmarelis and T. Berger, "General methodology for nonlinear modeling of neural systems with Poisson point-process inputs," *Mathematical Biosciences*, Vol. 196, No. 1, pp. 1-13, 2005.

[5] D. L. Snyder, L. J. Thomas, and M. M. Ter-Pogossian, "A mathematical model for positron-emission tomography systems having time-of-flight measurements," *IEEE Trans. Nuclear Science*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 3575-3583, June 1981.

[6] R. Hoseinnezhad, B.-N. Vo, B.-T. Vo, and D. Suter, "Visual tracking of numerous targets via multi-Bernoulli filtering of image data," *Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 45, No. 10, pp. 3625-3635, Oct. 2012.

[7] F. Baccelli, M. Klein, M. Lebourges, and S. A. Zuyev, "Stochastic geometry and architecture of communication networks," *Telecommunication Systems*, Vol. 7, No. 1-3, pp. 209-227, 1997.

[8] D. Angelosante, E. Biglieri and M. Lops, "Multiuser detection in a dynamic environment. Part II: Joint user identification and parameter estimation," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Vol. 55, No. 5, pp. 2365-2374, May 2009.

[9] R. Mahler, "Multitarget Bayes filtering via first-order multitarget moments," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp. 1152-1178, Oct 2003.

[10] R. Mahler, Advances in Statistical Multisource-Multitarget Information Fusion, Artech House, 2014.

[11] J. Mullane, B.-N. Vo, M. Adams, and B.-T. Vo, "A random-finite-set approach to Bayesian SLAM," *IEEE Trans. Robotics*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 268-282, Apr. 2011.

[12] B. T. Vo and W. K.Ma, "The gaussian mixture probability hypothesis density filter," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 54, No. 11, pp. 4091-4104, Nov. 2006.

[13] R. Mahler, "PHD filters of higher order in target number," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 1523-1543, Oct. 2007.

[14] B. T. Vo, B. N. Vo and A. Cantoni, "The cardinality balanced multi-target multi-Bernoulli filter and its implementation," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 409-423, Feb. 2009.

[15] B. T. Vo, B. N. Vo, N. T. Pham and D. Suter, "Joint detection and estimation of multiple objects from image observation," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 58, No. 10, pp. 5129-5141, Oct. 2010.

[16] B. T. Vo and B. N. Vo, "Labeled random finite sets and multi-object conjugate priors," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 61, No. 13, pp. 3460-3475, Jul. 2013.

[17] B. N. Vo, B. T. Vo, and D. Phung, "Labeled random finite sets and the Bayes multi-target tracking filter," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 62, No. 24, pp. 3460-3475, Dec. 2014.

[18] C. Fantacci, B. T. Vo, F. Papi, and B. N. Vo, "The marginalized $\delta$-GLMB filter," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.00926*, 2015.

[19] M. Beard, B. T. Vo, and B. N. Vo, "Bayesian multi-object tracking with merged measurements using labelled random finite sets," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 63, No. 16, pp. 4348-4358, Aug. 2015.

[20] S. Reuter, B. T. Vo, B. N. Vo, and K. Dietmayer, "The labeled multi-Bernoulli filter," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 62, No. 12, pp. 3246-3240, Jun. 2014.

[21] F. Papi and D. Y. Kim, "A particle multi-object tracker for superpositional measurements using labeled random finite sets," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 63, pp. 4348-4358, 2015.

[22] Suqi Li, Wei Yi, Bailu Wang, Lingjiang Kong, "Principled Random Finite Set Approximations of Labeled Multi-object Density," submitted to *Proc. IEEE Int. Fusion Conf.*, 2016.

[23] F. Papi and A. K. Gostar, "Bayesian track-before-detect for closely spaced targets," presented at the 23rd European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO), 2015.

[24] J. Vermaak, S. J. Godsill, and P. Perez, "Monte Carlo filtering for multi-target tracking and data association," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 41, pp. 309-332, 2005.

[25] M. Orton and W. Fitzgerald, "A Bayesian approach to tracking multiple targets using sensor arrays and particle filters," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 216-223, 2002.

[26] A. F. Garcia-Fernandez, J. Grajal, and M. R. Morelande, "Two-layer particle filter for multiple target detection and tracking," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, 2013.

[27] M. R. Morelande, C. M. Kreucher, and K. Kastella, "A Bayesian Approach to Multiple Target Detection and Tracking," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 55, pp. 1589-1604, May 2007.

[28] W. Yi, M. Morelande, L. Kong, and J. Yang, "A computationally efficient particle filter for multi-target tracking using an independence approximation," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, vol. 66, pp. 843-856, Feb. 2013.

[29] B. Ristic, S. Arulampalam, and N. J. Gordon, Beyond the Kalman filter: particle filters for tracking applications. Norwood, MA: Artech House, 2004.

[30] D. Schumacher, B. T. Vo and B. N. Vo, "A consistent metric for performance evaluation of multi-object filters," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Process.*, Vol. 56, No. 8, pp. 3447-3457, Aug. 2008.